

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-2, 4, 6-19, 22-24, 26-28, 31-33, and 38-41 remain pending in the application. By this paper, claims 1, 11, 14, 22, 28, 31-33, and 38-41 have been amended and claims 12-13 are canceled. No new matter is believed to be introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in light of the amendments and arguments herein is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview Summary

Representatives of the Applicants, Nair Flores and David Ishimaru, and attorneys for the Applicants, Nathan Greene and Scott Brim, conducted an in-person interview on June 10, 2008. Discussed with Examiner Phillip C. Lee were the pending claims and the cited art.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10-13, 16-19, 22-24, 26-27, 33, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,379,251 ("Auxier") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,826,594 ("Pettersen"). Claims 39, 40, and 41 stand rejected under § 103(a) over Auxier and Pettersen in view of "Official Notice." Claims 9, 28, and 31-32 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Auxier and Pettersen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,659 ("Landsman"). Claim 14 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Auxier and Pettersen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,660 ("Eggleston"). Claim 15 was rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Auxier and Pettersen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,790,138 ("Erichman"). The Applicants respectfully submit that these references, alone or combined, do not disclose each and every feature of the claims.

The Applicants rely on its arguments from its response dated June 3, 2008 to the extent the arguments still relate to the current claims, as amended. The below remarks are drawn primarily to the current amendments in claims 1 and 33.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

an enhancement module for altering an output format of the advertisement content object in real time after being loaded by the request/load module, wherein altering the advertisement content object comprises partitioning the content object into a plurality of image data pieces, and scrambling at least some of the plurality of image data pieces relative to each other for presentation as an interactive game.

This amendment finds support at least at FIGS. 7, 13, and 19 and corresponding specification, such as at page 12, lines 12-19 and at page 13, lines 5-6, 10-16.

Petterson does not disclose or suggest at least “partitioning the content object into a plurality of image data pieces, and scrambling at least some of the plurality of image data pieces relative to each other for presentation as an interactive game” as an aspect of dynamically rearranging or reformatting static content. Petterson is drawn to remote content management of web pages, not creating scrambled versions of served advertisement content objects.

Auxier, furthermore, also fails to disclosure the amended features. Auxier, as discussed in the response filed June 2, 2008, discloses creation and serving of a scratch off game to a web page for interaction by a user. The content is not partitioned and then “scrambled as a plurality of image data pieces relative to each other for presentation as an interactive game.” Accordingly, Auxier fails to disclose or suggest the amended features of claim 1.

For at least these additional reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the cited art, either alone or as combined, and the rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2, 4, and 6-11, and 14-19 are believed to be patentable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claims 33, as amended, recites:

executing the enhancement module in real time such that image data from the advertisement content object is partitioned into a plurality of image data pieces, at least some of which are scrambled relative to each other for presentation to a user as an interactive game.

This amendment finds support in at least the same passages as the amendment of claim 1, discussed above. Likewise, claim 33 is patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Peterson and Auxier, either alone or as combined, fail to disclose or suggest that “the advertisement content object is partitioned into a plurality of image data pieces, at least some of which are scrambled relative to each other for presentation to a user as an interactive game.”

For at least these additional reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the cited art, either alone or as combined, and the rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 38-41 are believed to be patentable by virtue of their dependency from claim 33.

The Applicants respectfully rely on its response filed on June 3, 2008 for all other claims rejected in the most current Office Action. With this response, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the examiner deem another telephone conference to be of assistance in advancing the application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the below telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan O. Greene/

Nathan O. Greene
Registration No. 56,956
Attorney for Applicants

June 26, 2008
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
405 South Main Street, Suite 800
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-3400
(801) 355-7900